

**ALAN WATT BLURB (i.e. Educational Talk):**  
**"BEE-HIVE-YOUR-ALL BEHAVIOUR**  
**BY**  
**BEHAVIOURIST'S AGENDA"**  
**September 13, 2007**

**Dialogue Copyrighted Alan Watt - September 13, 2007**  
**(Exempting Music and Literary Quotes)**

[WWW.CUTTINGTHROUGHTHEMATRIX.COM](http://WWW.CUTTINGTHROUGHTHEMATRIX.COM)

[www.alanwattsentientsentinel.eu](http://www.alanwattsentientsentinel.eu)

Hi folks. I'm Alan Watt and this is [cuttingthroughthematrix.com](http://cuttingthroughthematrix.com). You'll also find me at [alanwattsentientsentinel.eu](http://alanwattsentientsentinel.eu). It is September 13th, 2007.

You know that I don't plan my talks, whether it's on radio or the blurbs. I generally come to a vague formula a few minutes before I start and let it flow from there, because otherwise you become like regular broadcasters, like the planned society we live in. The planned TV and radio which we hear all around us, where producers and their own little research teams come up with topics to discuss. We've had enough of that, I think, all of us and that's why I try to talk as though I were talking to someone across the table. It's the only way to really communicate with people and to put out ideas. I don't give all the solutions. I put out ideas. I put out facts as we know them and allow others to come to their own conclusions, because we do live in a very controlled society, not just recently either, it's really always been that way. We have to go back through history and find out how it got to this level of control.

Ancient times to fairly modern times relied upon religions to give and reinforce the culture, so when you have everyone doing the same rituals, giving the same catch phrases, then you feel you belong; and when you feel you belong, you are absorbed into the culture. You're absorbed by it. You feel a sense of safety or belonging. When we feel we don't belong, then it's a symptom of a sick society. The reinforcements we have don't stand up to the tests of logic, history or value; and even the ones that last a long time like religion change over centuries. Christianity, for instance, in the west that is practiced today is as vague and remote from early Christianity as you can imagine. It's almost a different organization all together and it's the same with every other religion.

With the advent of the 16th century primarily, we find that humankind especially the leisured classes began to experiment into the sciences. Courts of kings and queens paid in fact salaries to educated people to investigate nature. Their prime concern wasn't really because they wanted to know how flowers grow. It was to know how things worked, in order to try some day to get control over other things, but primarily mankind itself. That was always the goal because leaders in all ages have been afraid of the general public.

The more extravagant their cut from the general public, their salaries and their lifestyle, the more it differentiates itself from the general population. The gap widens with riches at the top and more poverty at the bottom, the more nervous they become; therefore they put all their faith into ways of manipulating the minds of the public to control them. There are many well-known scientists who've been involved and employed by the big foundations, which really front for the elite in the investigation of the human mind and how to control it, and every facet of science has been used. Every part of it the behaviorists in psychology were heavily funded, for instance, as well as all the other groupings of psychology, the little differentiations of them. It's all because they couldn't miss anything. All data is important and that's why knowledge is never destroyed by leaders in any civilization.

B.F. Skinner was a well-known behaviorist who was allowed to do things which people in the general public could never have gotten away with. The reason for it being, he was chosen to do this and backed and financed to do this and given the loopholes through the law because the ones at the top had commanded it. He even experimented with his own daughter and put her in a cage. B.F. Skinner was a true "scientist," as far as science goes, in that he studied all data discompassionately to find out why things happen in human life, why nature is the way it is and mainly to find out how people will be predicted to behave in certain situations.

One of the books he wrote is called "**About Behaviorism**" and this copy is by Vintage Books. It's a division of London House. I'm not sure exactly when this was published. I think it was 1974. It's full of little maxims and so on, little quips that are very true, but also shows you that his mind really was set on the Darwinist principles, as pretty well all the scientists ever since the age of Darwin have gone into. They believe in survival of the fittest. They don't see right or wrong because right and wrong can change with every generation if it's made to be so from the top down. They understand these sciences because they've been given side or parallel educations to the general public, where they have access to data denied the general public.

On page 220, this little chapter is entitled "**Controlling Social Environment**," and he said:

*"People have suffered so long and so painfully from the controls imposed upon them that it is easy to understand why they so bitterly oppose any form of control. A simple analysis of controlling practices, such as that in the preceding chapter, is likely to be attacked simply because it could be misused by controllers. But in the long run any effective counter-control leading to the "liberation" of the individual can be achieved only by its explicit design, and this must be based upon a scientific analysis of human behavior. We must surely begin with the fact that human behavior is always controlled." Man is born free," said Rousseau, "and is everywhere in chains," but no one is less free than a newborn child, nor will he become free as he grows older. His only hope is that he will come under the control of a natural and social environment in which he will make the most of his genetic endowment and in doing so most successfully pursue happiness."*

Skinner and most of them at the top, in fact all of them at the top believe that

genetic endowment gives you success and intellect, physical fitness, all of those things will help you succeed, but what they don't mention is that it will help you succeed in *this* system – this system which is based on money, which is a form of reinforcement in itself to keep going and get more. That's your incentive. This is the Pavlovian technique that was in existence long before Pavlov. Therefore, at the top, they truly believe in eugenics. They always have believed in eugenics and that's what really Darwinism is based upon: the survival of the fittest and survival itself of the fittest, meaning they're willing to kill others in order that they should survive themselves. That's the bottom line and that was shown in Arthur C. Clarke's movie **"2001"** at the beginning, where the two rival tribes of apes go down to the watering hole and shake their fists at each other across the water. They have a few jumps up and down and yell, have their drinks and then they go home, but no one is hurt. Civilization in that movie began with one ape that we would call "deviant," because anything outside the normal group is deviant, you see, but that one ape used a big thigh bone as a weapon that went across and killed the leader of the other tribe, so the first murder was the start of civilization. That's why they say in the higher groups in societies that civilization is brutal, which is true.

Because of our conditioning and because most people are absorbed into what they think is a natural culture that's evolved, they will tend to be upset when someone points out little items within that culture which upset them or make them nervous. They make them nervous because it brings them close to a thought they might not want to have. You see, these scientists are not all wrong. They have observed cultures for many, many centuries. They've studied the human behavior of male and female and every age group throughout life for centuries, and they know how to formulate cultures; create them and manipulate them update them, just like you update and upgrade a computer program, and those who are in the program will ask to figure it out when things go wrong.

The majority of the public never question what they think is their reality, and they're taught to think this, and reinforced again in school in education, that we just evolved to this stage by chance and by the occasional martyr in history that had a good idea and gave their life to make it happen. That's the traditional story we have down through the centuries, yet nothing is further from the truth because power has never voluntarily given itself up to another system. What it does is to give fronts of a new system, but you still have the same dominant minority controlling it from behind the scenes. This is to placate the people and keep them happy.

In the 1700's the elite of Europe, the wealthy elite of Europe had many meetings. There were so many philosophers at that time giving all points of view, all sides of every story and publishing them in books, and the elite were reading them and they thought they could make use of this science of psychology, the science of the mind, of the mass-mind, and they employed many of these philosophers to do their bidding. They employed ones to become champions of a new system that would front for them, which eventually was called "democracy," much like our own. When the public think they're free, when they think they have a voice, they're much easier to manage.

Democracy itself keeps changing its form or its definition, because the democracy they had in the home of democracy in England was vastly different a few hundred

years ago than it is today, in appearance at least, because only the nobility at that time had any say in anything. Eventually this was extended to property and landowners, and that held for a long time, up into the 1900's, when the vote was given eventually to ordinary people who had no property and who rented and who labored at the bottom class. Yet the elite have always governed the country and every other old and new country. Therefore, when people like Skinner talk, we shouldn't get our defenses up. We should try and see through the eyes of someone who is psychopathic by nature – a person who has worked with people and animals and conducted various experiments that would shock you, a person with no compassion, just a clinical interest into why this action causes this reaction to the victim or “subject,” as he would like to call it.

Therefore, you must learn what they're after. You must learn how they think. You must learn what their motivations are. You'll find by your own research, as everyone else must find by their own research and has in the past, that these people are megalomaniacs. They love power for power's sake, and that is also the part of the Darwinian theory. The most successful are the ones who breed the best. In other words, pick the right mates and have offspring, and those offspring become even more elite and more power hungry. The power itself can be interchanged with the survival instinct in their own religion; and it is a religion because the whole Darwinist theory is based upon a belief. Theory, remember, is what the bottom people are taught. Theory means a good guess, but it's still a guess. It isn't a fact until it's proven by empirical testing. Can it be proven over and over again? Until then, it's just theory.

You'll find today for the masses most education to do with the sciences at the low level is based all on theory, and often the theories change. Without mentioning they just change overnight and you have a new theory to replace the old one that was taught as law; and people passed and did thesis on them and they got their degrees, yet they're all bogus. Now they're coming up with new theories all the time and we're supposed to adapt to them without noticing that, how can one thing be taught as a gospel truth for 20, 30, 40, 50 years and suddenly another one is the gospel truth and the old one is out the window? How can you have faith in the new one? There are higher levels of science where they don't use theory, they have facts, but it's not taught to the public.

Back to page 221 of the book by B.F. Skinner "**About Behaviorism**" and to reiterate this now about Rousseau that:

*"Man is born free and is everywhere in chains but no one is less free than a newborn child, nor will he become free as he grows older. His only hope is that he will come under the control of a natural and social environment in which he will make the most of his genetic endowment and in doing so most successfully pursue happiness. His family and his peers are part of that environment and he will benefit if they behave in ethical ways. Education is another part of that environment and he will acquire the most effective repertoire if his teachers recognize their role for what it is rather than assume that is to leave him free to develop himself."*

He's admitting here that schooling and education is not and has not been to help develop you as an individual. It's meant to give you a **repertoire**, and that's a term they use in behaviorism. You'll find people who argue all the time, who haven't

studied anything really for themselves, but take on movements or join social organizations for emotive reasons only, give slogans all the time – these are repertoires – and for everything you say they have a counter, which is another slogan they've been taught. They go through repertoires like a machine. Repertoires are the outcomes of the conditioning of problem solving by the use of language and logic. You're trained at school to use a certain type of logic, coupled with the information that's downloaded into you and you'll come to expected conclusions. The conclusion therefore which is expected is called part of a repertoire.

### **To continue:**

*"His government is part of that environment, and it will "govern least" if it minimizes its punitive measures. He will produce what he and others need more effectively and least aversively if incentive conditions are such that he works carefully and industriously and is reinforced by what he does. All of this will be possible not because those with whom he associates possess morality and a sense of ethics or decency or compassion, but because they in turn are controlled by a particular kind of social environment."*

**Alan:** Your social environment, culture et cetera, all that surrounds you, is part of the reinforcement that he is talking about. The things you take for granted. Most folk don't question the system in which they live. It exists. It must be natural. Everyone else accepts it as natural because they don't talk about it much. They just do it. They live it. They don't ask where it came from, who developed it or where it's going. They simply want to get up the ladder in the system; and that's called "pursuing happiness," at least to guys like Skinner because they see you as a creature like an animal. Your facial expressions, your gestures, those that show happiness, those that show sadness, are just the expressions of another creature through the eyes of a psychopath, who studies you like any other creature. It doesn't mean that their observations are completely wrong either. That's why they can use their theories and make them fact and they work.

*"The most important contribution of a social environment —a contribution wholly abandoned in the return to a thoroughgoing individualism— has to do with the mediation of the future. The brutal prospect of overpopulation..."*

**Alan:** Again, that's one of their big concerns at the top, always has been in all ages.

*"...pollution..."*

**Alan:** Pollution – which is the big one to reduce the population, the big stick, and to bring in a new system.

*"...and the exhaustion of resources has given the future a new and relatively immediate significance, but some concern for the future has, of course, long prevailed. It has been said that a hundred years ago "there were few men alive, whether Utilitarians or religious people, who then thought of the goodness of an*

*act as being in the act itself or in the will that willed it; all was in the consequences, for their happiness tomorrow or the "life hereafter; both were matters of future reward."*

**Alan:** See that was used up until fairly recently, most of the world over. Just work your butt off. Suffer here and you get a future reward. Very, very simple, you didn't have much thinking to do.

*"But goodness in the light of which an act may be judged is one thing; inducing people to be good or to act well "for the sake of a future consequence" is another. The important thing is that institutions..."*

**Alan:** Now listen to this.

*"...institutions last longer than individuals and arrange contingencies which take a reasonably remote future into account."*

**Alan:** What he's telling you in a few words is that the future is always planned, and I've been saying this over and over again. People who wake up in the system to the fact that it's changing – and that's really what happens, it's that change in their environment, something that affects them personally that makes them start to question things. They're prone to be mislead by many who are put out there deliberately to mislead you into giving you answers, and you'll find you're simply going around in a circle with a dialectical process working. In other words, force, counter-force, back and forth, back and forth, left wing, right wing, et cetera. However, these characters know this. They know that you think in short-term rewards. You think in a lifetime. That lifetime to you is a long time when you're a child. It seemed so incredibly vast and long when you look at older people. Our lives are so short. We're short-term planners. We want to see something achieved that we start in our own lifetime. In fact it's very difficult for us to imagine starting something and not seeing it finished in our lifetime. We're impatient.

*"...where the institutions..."*

**Alan:** That means government too.

*"...and the big foundations..."*

**Alan:** That are part of their big arm since the creation of what we call democracy. They think in centuries ahead, many centuries ahead, including the changes that they want to achieve. How to bring society from this kind of society, including the relationships between peoples, that's all part of societal structure, including male and female relationships. All of these and parent children relationships. How do we get them from here to here, which might be the complete opposite, and has actually been planned to be the complete opposite, when you go into genetic engineering and cloning, and then you have a whole new type of parenthood et cetera. Already parenthood is altered vastly through all the laws have been passed and the different kinds who can adopt et cetera. This is all to get us in flux to change, not because they care about one group or the other group. It's because they know what they're end product is to be, and how you get society to move from there in a static situation to flux and into this particular future? They do it through planning, introduction and intergenerationally. That's how it has always

been done.

I'll repeat that little part again from page 222 of the book "**About Behaviorism**" by Skinner:

*"The important thing is that institutions last longer than individuals and arrange contingencies which take a reasonably remote future into account. The behavioral processes are illustrated by a person who works for a promised return, who plays a game in order to win, or who buys a lottery ticket. With their help, religious institutions make the prospect of an afterlife reinforcing, and governments induce people to die patriotic deaths.*

*We object to much of this, but the interests of institutions sometimes coincide with the interests of individuals; governments and religions sometimes induce people to behave well with respect to each other and to act together for protection and support. Proverbs and maxims, as well as explicit codes of law, strengthen behavior having deferred consequences. By himself an individual can acquire very little behavior with respect to the future in his own lifetime, but as a member of a group he profits from the social environment maintained by the group. This is a fact of the greatest importance because it leads to an answer to two basic questions: How can we call a particular instance of the control of human behavior good or bad, and who is to design and maintain controlling practices?"*

That, again, is why democracy is now defined as the will of the majority is taken into account but so is the will of minority groups. There's nothing in there about the individual anymore, so democracy is always changing because that's the schedule and that's the formula and there is an eventual end to all of this system, when even the word democracy won't be necessary anymore. Therefore, to have power in the system, as it stands legally today, you must belong to a minority group or to the larger group. The minority groups generally have the leaders chosen for them and they're part of the whole agenda. The leaders know where they're taking their followers. The followers generally don't. They think they're going to get some self-interest and benefits out of it and rights. No, they're being used and the foundations are generally the employers, the front men who work on behalf of the big governmental institutions.

On page 223 of the same book by Skinner, it's called "**The Evolution of A Culture.**"

*"The social environment I have been referring to is usually called a culture, though a culture is often defined in other ways—as a set of customs or manners, as a system of values and ideas, as a network of communication, and so on. As a set of contingencies of reinforcement maintained by a group, possibly formulated in rules or laws, it has a clear-cut physical status, a continuing existence beyond the lives of members of the group, a changing pattern as practices are added, discarded, or modified, and, above all, power. A culture so defined controls the behavior of the members of the group that practices it.*

*It is not a monolithic thing, and we have no reason to explain it by appealing to a group mind, idea, or will. If there are indeed "seventy-three elements of culture common to every human society still existing or known to history," then there must be seventy-three practices or kinds of practices in every*

*set of contingencies called a culture, each of which must be explained in terms of conditions prevailing before the culture emerged as such. Why do people develop a language? Why do they practice some kind of marriage? Why do they maintain moral practices and formulate them in codes? Some answers to questions of this sort are to be found in the biological characteristics of the species, others in "universal features" of the environments in which people live.*

*The important thing about a culture so defined is that it evolves. A practice arises as a mutation, it affects the chances that the group will solve its problems, and if the group survives, the practice survives with it. It has been selected by its contribution to the effectiveness of those who practice it. Here is another example of that subtle process called selection..."*

**Alan:** He's talking about natural selection.

*"...and it has the same familiar features. Mutations may be random. A culture need not have been designed, and its evolution does not show a purpose. The practices which compose a culture are a mixed bag, and some parts may be inconsistent with others or in open conflict. Our own culture is sometimes called sick, and in a sick society, man will lack a sense of identity and feelings of competence; he will see the suspension of his own thought structures to enter into a more fruitful relationship with those around him as betrayal; he will approach the world of human interaction with a sense of real despair; and only when he has been through that despair and learnt to know himself will he attain as much of what is self-fulfilling as the human condition allows."*

**Alan:** Now what he's saying there is taken from even ancient Greek philosophers because this was studied even thousands of years ago. They know the process that you'll go through. They understand that; and even those who can come through that process and survive and get stronger, they try to either recruit or eliminate if they become a problem.

He goes on to translate it in his own way:

*"In translation: a sick society if a set of contingencies which generate disparate or conflicting behaviors suggesting more than one self, which does not generate the strong behavior with which a feeling of competence is associated, which fails to generate successful social behavior and hence leads a person to call the behavior of others betrayal, and which, supplying only infrequent reinforcement, generates the condition felt as despair."*

**Alan:** You see to him emotions are irrelevant. He says the condition known as despair or felt as despair. He can't feel it himself you see.

*"Another writer said that our culture is "in convulsions owing to its state of value contradiction, its incorporation of opposing and conflicting values," but we may say that the values, here as elsewhere, refer to reinforcers, and that it is the contingencies of which they are a part which are opposing and conflicting. The society will be "cured" if it can be changed in such a way that a person is generously and consistently reinforced and therefore "fulfills himself" by acquiring and exhibiting the most successful behavior of which he is capable. Better ways of teaching (introduced for whatever reason, possibly only because of immediate*



*consequences for teacher or student) will make a more effective use of the human genetic endowment. Better incentive conditions..."*

**Alan:** Because they understand that we're all trained to work for incentives, just like they do it with laboratory rats and train them to pull levers and go through hoops and stuff to get a seed as a reward. We're trained the same way. He doesn't really differentiate our behavior to the animals at all; and there's a lot of truth in that too, because we've all been conditioned in the system in the same way.

*"Better incentive conditions (introduced for whatever reason, possibly only in the interests of management or labor) mean more and better goods and more enjoyable working conditions. Better ways of governing (introduced for whatever reason, possibly merely in the interests of governed or governor) mean less time wasted in personal defense and more time for other things. More interesting forms of art, music, and literature (created for whatever reason..."*

**Alan:** In other words, he's telling you that the culture industry you see, it doesn't matter what kind or anything they give you, as long as it achieves its purpose and we adapt to it and copy and mimic it.

*"...(created for whatever reason, possibly simply for the immediate reinforcement of those creating or enjoying them) mean fewer defections to other ways of life.*

*In a well-known passage in "The Descent of Man, Darwin wrote:*

*"Obscure as is the problem of the advance of civilization, we can at least see that the nation which produced, during a lengthened period, the greatest number of highly intellectual, energetic, brave, patriotic, and benevolent men, would generally prevail over less favored nations."*

*"The point survives when the appeal to character is corrected by speaking of "a nation which maintains a social environment in which its citizens behave in ways called intelligent, energetic, brave, patriotic, and benevolent." Darwin was speaking of the survival value of a culture."*

**Alan:** Now if you've ever wondered about the term used in all of the countries which are brought into this world structure under NAFTA, GATT and all the rest of it, the Free Trade enterprise, first spouted by John Dee in the 16th century at the court of Queen Elizabeth I, and why Darwin used the same term "*most favored nation*." The favored nations - they're talking about the civilizations they had decided would come through and survive, and those who didn't come in would be eliminated because they were backward, arrested civilizations, primitive et cetera. In other words, they'd never changed their culture. They'd never changed their methods of doing anything. They didn't mass-produce anything. They could make all their own tools and implements and survive quite happily. They're talking about the eradication of what they call "*inferior types*" and the countries allowed in to the big Free Trade, the Galactic Enterprise of the Star Trek Federation, would be the survivors the ones who are endowed genetically to survive. Therefore, little phrases are used in these characters books. If you understand what they mean you will understand a lot more than what they say.

*"There are remarkable similarities in natural selection, operant conditioning, and the evolution of social environments. Not only do all three dispense with a prior creative design and a prior purpose, they invoke the notion of survival as a value. What is good for the species is what makes for its survival. What is good for the individual is what promotes his well-being. What is good for a culture is what permits it to solve its problems. There are, as we have seen, other kinds of values, but they eventually take second place to survival. The notion of evolution is misleading—and it misled both Herbert Spencer and Darwin—when it suggests that the good represented by survival will naturally work itself out. Things go wrong under all three contingencies of selection, and they may need to be put right by explicit design."*

**Alan:** He's talking about planning the future. He wasn't suggesting something because he was employed by people who already were planning it and had been before he was born.

**He goes on to say:**

*"Breeding practices have long represented a kind of intervention in the evolution of the species..."*

**Alan:** Back to eugenics.

*"...and geneticists are now talking about changing genetic codes."*

**Alan:** Remember, too, this book was written back in '74 and it was not new then. They were talking about changing it long, long before that.

*"The behavior of the individual is easily changed by designing new contingencies of reinforcement."*

**Alan:** That's what George Orwell was talking about with the sheep in "**Animal Farm**." In "**Animal Farm**" the vast majority of the population in this new revolutionary group were sheep, or "sheeple" as we now call them, and every so often the pig would come out and give the slogan and they'd reply in kind that "*two legs bad, four legs good*." Then one day the pig when he joined the humans in a compromise and shouted "*two legs good, four legs bad*" and the sheep parroted it anyway, in fact they didn't notice any difference.

*"New Cultural practices are explicitly designed in such fields as education, psychotherapy, penology, and economic incentives. The design of human behavior implies, of course, control, and possibly the question most often asked of the behaviorist is this: Who is to control? The question represents the age-old mistake of looking to the individual rather than to the world in which he lives. It will not be a benevolent dictator, a compassionate therapist, a devoted teacher, or a public-spirited industrialist who will design a way of life in the interests of everyone. We must look instead at the conditions under which people govern, give help, teach, and arrange incentive systems in particular ways."*

**Alan:** Now he's talking about "we." He means the behaviorists, you see, the

professionals.

*"We must look instead at the conditions under which people govern, give help, teach, and arrange incentive systems in particular ways. In other words we must look to the culture as a social environment. Will a culture evolve in which no individual will be able to accumulate vast power and use it for his own aggrandizement in ways which are harmful to others? Will a culture evolve in which individuals are not so much concerned with their own actualization and fulfillment that they do not give serious attention to the future of the culture? These questions, and many others like them, are the questions to be asked rather than who will control and to what end. No one steps outside the causal stream. No one really intervenes. Mankind has slowly but erratically created environments in which people behave more effectively and no doubt enjoy the feelings which accompany successful behavior. It is a continuing process."*

**Alan:** What I'm showing here, hopefully, is that all of that which you take as normal, including the changes in our society, our lifetime, is planned that way. It was planned before you were born. The whole idea is how to get the herd from, as I say, this field over to that field, which is quite a ways off. How would you get them to go through all these changes and to accept it all, every part of it, every step they take is normal, with all the changes that come along with it? Then you realize we're trained by professionals. Make no mistake, education is all about controlling the mind to creating a mass mind for the general public. That's why it's a standardized education. You become standardized. It does not tell you to become a true individual. It doesn't promote individual thinking. In fact it distains it. It's all group-think, especially today more so. Everything is group-think and you must go along with the group or you will be shunned. Again, old techniques that they used in religion and within religious societies as well.

An education that was not authorized and controlled and carefully scrutinized by the top could not exist. What is good according to those at the top is to obey. A good society is an obedient society. This of course can cause conflicts down the road when the top want a different outcome within society. Society always thinks it knows where it's going, sort of vaguely, vaguely knows where we're going, they think, and yet when they notice there's a conflict, then the elite want you to obey anyway. When you don't obey immediately, they terrorize you or give you another fear of something coming down. It's either going to be the wrath of God or a comet, as in the old days, or it's going to be the Russians that are going to nuke you or something like that. Something to terrify you into obedience and to stun you into not thinking, because when you're terrified of losing your life you're not worrying about other theories or other problems of other peoples. You're thinking about your immediate survival, and when you're in that mode you can be moved very quickly through massive changes within society.

We see this even with the worldwide trend right after 9/11. It didn't happen spontaneously. All the agendas, all the anti-terrorism laws had been drafted many, many years before and signed by all the NATO countries and even countries outside of NATO. That's why they all went into action at the same time and put the same laws on the books; the identical same laws and the same formula because it was all planned that way.

Margaret Thatcher talked about it in the 1980's that the next war of the west

would be with "*religious fundamentalists*" she called them. You can look into her histories, look into the newspaper accounts like the *Toronto Sun* article that reported her at Massey Hall saying this very thing. The title of her talk was *The New World Order*. Check into it and you'll see that they knew what was coming down. The beauty of "conspiracy" – conspiracy comes out when government by its very nature is secretive and causes paranoia. We also do know that they occasionally 50 years later tell us the truth, which should definitely make us all suspicious of what they do. Really, 9/11 had to happen to get the agenda on the road, basically. It had to happen.

***The Project for the New American Century***, the club who wrote their agenda out on what they'd like to do with the Middle East and other countries as America was to take over, or the U.S. was to take over, the lead of policeman of the world from other countries, which it already was, of course, since World War II, but more officially so. They knew that they needed something to kick off the agenda. They needed to win the lotto at the right time. They published their agenda and now they're simply going through with it, because in a world society—and that's the goal of it, world society—there can be no separate old-fashioned type religious bodies existing.

I've said before, look at your religions here in the west and see how incredibly different they are from 100 years ago, 200 years ago, 500 and 1,000 years ago or 2,000 years ago; constantly changing, until now they're so diluted that most Christians today are really the backers, they're the cheering team for whatever the government does – the tyrannical government. They cheer them on; and yet the founder supposedly of this religion was killed for standing up to authorities and the economic system of his day and the legal system of his day. Those countries which still are fairly traditional, regardless of how they're ruled, because psychopaths, as I say, always end up at the top in every culture in a monetary system. The fact is, according to the agenda, that's to be altered and this democracy, which everyone thinks they understand but they don't because they've never even examined the meaning of it and the previous meanings of it, this democracy is to be used worldwide.

Yet they will need a common enemy to keep man united. Man needs an enemy to obey government, especially when they're going to be heavily taxed and regulated and so on. They need an enemy to try and justify it, therefore the enemy, as within the borders of the Soviet Union, once they'd established their position and they had no real threats, they had to find enemies within to justify all that they were doing; and that has to be done with a world culture too. Therefore, under the guise of terrorism you're going to see it evolve into regular psychological testing, all the way down to brain chips and so on for everyone's safety. Of course that was the goal before it all started, long before 9/11 happened.

As I say, everything that happens in a major way in history and is claimed as a surprise, it's nonsense. You can't keep little covert plans and rebellions secret in this day and age. It's impossible, absolutely impossible. Big think tanks, big foundations, big organizations of spies, right down to little guys who that are part-timers are employed in every single country on the planet. You can't plan something on the scale of 9/11 and keep it secret. It's impossible. It had to happen because it was necessary to happen. Now the whole world is going into ID cards and body cavity searches and all this nonsense as we get trained to obey, obey,

obey, because when the greatest changes in the cultures are being forced through, they want you to be terrified at the same time so you won't think about them so much. You're simply worried about your personal security and survival.

Where does this leave the individual?

The individual is left out of this picture in this big agenda, therefore it's up to the individual to keep hold of the reality and find the reality for themselves that is truer to themselves, because ultimately that's all you have to go on. If you can't be true to yourself, then you can't be true to anything. You'll also be in flux, and when you're in flux you'll be in despair. If you find yourself and you fathom your way through all this morass of deception and conditioning, there's a peace that comes with it when you start to understand it. Suddenly things make sense for the first time. Many things begin to make sense for the first time. Everything that you've read before suddenly makes sense for the first time because you see it in a different light all together. Then you must look at the mayhem all around you of all those who still think that they're normal because they haven't broken out of their conditioning, and you feel very said for them, very sorry for them as they go through their trials in a dysfunctional system.

You'll see the squabbles and the fights over money, over property, over everything, all the usual squabbles that you're seeing as the culture gets harder and harder to keep rolling along in that hamster's treadmill. It's faster and faster. That can't happen, it's breaking down and society is still trying to go on like the previous generation did and it's not working. It's not working as the culture industry goes into overdrive through Dr. Phil and Oprah and all the rest of it to try to formulate a new culture in your mind, to accept new adaptations to the breakdown of the culture and adapt and go on into the next. "Accept, accept, adapt, adapt" is what you're being told really. "Stop having points of view" is what you're being told. "Accept these points of view. These are the healthy ones." That's what you're told, and yet that means being untrue to yourself if you do adopt them.

Those in religion will still hope and hope and hope as always that the evil nasty people in the world will burn in hell forever after they're dead, because they certainly don't burn here in any way, shape or form unless it's heartburn after a very expensive meal. We don't see any intervention of justice in this world; therefore you must go on personal experience. You must accept your own personal experiences and you rationalize them because you are the judge at the end of it all. You are the judge on what is true, false; real, unreal; and don't be afraid to admit that your ego was conned. You were conned by very intelligent people who created a system in a scientific manner before you were even a gleam in your father's eye. Don't be afraid to admit you've been had. Some of you out there too, don't be afraid to admit that you've been conned by the other ones out there who've led you off into incredible stories round the galaxies and back, in many different forms, which have wasted a few more years of your life. These are intentional.

Very clever people do exist. These sciences have been known for eons. Since at least the 1700's, masses of money went into the creation of investigation on behalf of a dominant minority to learn all of these sciences, to learn them in more intricate detail so they can be applied more effectively - the sciences of the mind. You have a mind. That's an incredible gift, incredible gift. You're not just a

machine full of responses and synapses et cetera. There's far more to a person than that.

What I've been reading is Skinner, and he and other psychopaths have nothing else in them. They are more machines actually than anybody else. They don't have the normal emotions. The closest thing to an emotion of Skinner and people like himself is to see the effects of some animal crying for mercy as they're bashing its head into some motorized hammer. That's what stimulates these characters into interest, which is the closest response they can have to anything vaguely resembling human. These are mutants. In fact that's a part of their religion, their theory or religion of Darwinism. They claim that it's the occasional mutant down through history, mutated by whatever means, that causes the changes. Without the mutants there wouldn't be changes. They're talking about themselves as a psychopathic group.

That's enough of this stuff for tonight. From Hamish and myself, in Ontario, Canada, it's good night and may your god or your gods go with you.

---

### **"No Genocide Mix" by Mid-West LAMBSBREAD**

The techniques of creating terror are nothing new in order to get populations to submit and it's been done since the days of ancient Rome. They were experts at it, always terrorizing the public and then sending their own troops on the public to terrify them even more, under the guise of safety and they took all their rights from them over and over again, so it's a science. This is a science; generally loosely called fascism.

It's interesting because the techniques of creating terror are nothing new in order to get populations to submit, and it's been done since the days of ancient Rome. Always terrorizing the public and then sending their own troops on the public to terrify them even more, under the guise of safety and they took all their rights from them.

These are all part of culture creation. He said [Plato] nothing is allowed to come up from the grassroots. It's authorized from the top.

HIV and Hepatitis in the blood...I kept telling people ten years ago when we first learned of it. Now it's finally on MSNBC and admitted that no one's going to get in trouble, but the public isn't worried about just one drug company killing hundreds of thousands. They're worried about imaginary Muslim extremists.

This is the story of how the elite sold the people into slavery. In the early years of the 21st century terrorism was used by governments across the world as a pretext to scare their populations into submission.

Our enemies have made clear the danger they pose to our security.

Life became a surveillance...with individuals' actions ruthlessly cataloged and

recorded by the state. Warrants and warrantless searches spread...the final international police state ... culminating in open martial law  
In the early years of the 21st century terrorism was used by governments across the world as a pretext to scare their populations into submission.

This is the story of how the elite sold the people into slavery, and scared the once proud, brave people of the West into submitting to being cannon fodder in wars for world domination.

**(Transcribed by Linda)**